

# DRAFT

## M. EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

### M.1. GENERAL EVALUATION INFORMATION

The criteria specified in this section will apply to both the Primary and Backup computer systems. Careful, full, and impartial consideration will be given to offers received pursuant to this solicitation. Only Offerors which demonstrate acceptable submission to the Government of all items included in Section L of this solicitation (or amendments thereof) will be considered for award. This includes:

- \$ Submitting a proposal that meets all minimum requirements.
- \$ Submitting a proposal that complies with all requirements of law, regulation, and conditions set forth in the solicitation.
- \$ Submitting a proposal that meets all technical requirements and specifications of the solicitation.

**In evaluating all areas of an Offeror's proposal, the Government may consider risk (i.e., technical, schedule, cost, etc.). Risk may affect the Summary Rating of the offeror's proposals.**

#### M.1.1. Minimum Requirements

Proposals that fail to meet any of the Level 1 Requirements cited in Section C 2.3.1.4 System Dependability will be considered unacceptable. Proposed systems unable to meet Numerical Reproducibility requirements (Section C 2.3.1.2.1) will be considered non compliant.

#### M.1.2. Competitive Range

The Contracting Officer will make the determination as to which offers are in the Competitive Range. The Competitive Range shall be comprised of all of the most highly-rated proposals unless the range is further reduced for purposes of efficiency pursuant to FAR 15.306(c)(2). All Offerors in the competitive range will be invited to participate in the live test demonstration (LTD). The initial number of offers considered as being within the competitive range may be reduced when, as a result of the written or oral discussions, or LTD, an offer has been determined to no longer be among the most highly-rated proposals or have a reasonable chance of being selected for award.

#### M.1.3. Discussion/ Final Proposal Revision

All Offerors selected to participate in discussions will be advised of deficiencies, serious weaknesses, and other aspects of their proposal remediation which might materially enhance their offers, as well as negative comments concerning past performance. Offerors will be presented a reasonable opportunity to revise the price and technical parts of their proposal accordingly and to address unfavorable reports of past performance. A final common cut-off date that allows a reasonable opportunity for submission of written responses to discussion issues shall be established, and those Offerors remaining in the competitive range will be notified to submit a final proposal revision.

#### M.1.4. Responsibility

11/10/2004

An Offeror must be determined responsible according to the standards in FAR Subpart 9.1, RESPONSIBLE PROSPECTIVE CONTRACTORS.

#### **M.1.5. Evaluation of Options**

##### **Optional Period of Performance**

The system performance levels offered for the OCCS will be the only factors used in the Technical Evaluation to evaluate the solution proposed for the option period. However, in constructing proposals, Offerors must assume that overall system dependability and balance among the OCCS components will be maintained during the option period. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise option(s).

#### **M.1.6. Vendor Provided Facility**

Offerors must supply a suitable facility in accordance with Section C.2.3.13. An Offeror's facility must comply with the specifications in Appendix B. An evaluation of compliance with these specifications will be performed.

### **M.2. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS**

To be acceptable and eligible for award, proposals must be prepared in accordance with, and comply with, the instructions given in this solicitation document and must meet the specifications and requirements set forth in Section C. Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the procedures described herein and award made to the responsible Offeror whose proposal is determined to be the most advantageous to the Government.

All proposals will be evaluated based on the technical, past performance, and price factors described in this section. Proposals will be evaluated with a view toward award of a contract presenting the most favorable offer to the Government; therefore, proposals must contain sufficient information to conduct a detailed and thorough evaluation.

The Offeror's proposal must give clear, detailed information sufficient to enable an evaluation based on the major factors and sub-factors listed below.

Major factors considered in the evaluation of offers are as follows:

- ! **System Performance** - This factor will receive a narrative description. **For all Offerors in the competitive range, the Live Test Demonstration will affect the rating of this factor.**
- ! **Other Technical** - This factor will receive a narrative description. **For all Offerors in the competitive range, the Live Test Demonstration will affect the rating of this factor.**
- ! **Past Performance** - The Offeror's proposal will receive a rating based on documented information regarding such factors as quality, dependability, timeliness, customer satisfaction, personnel, cost control and business practices that the Offeror has demonstrated on projects of a similar scope and nature in the past.
- ! **Price** - The price proposal will be evaluated for magnitude and realism. Price factors will also

11/10/2004

be used as a further indication of Offeror's understanding of the scope of the requirement. Life Cycle Costs will be evaluated.

#### **M.2.1. Basis for Award**

The contract awarded as a result of this Request for Proposals (RFP) will be an integrated assessment by the Contracting Officer of the results of the evaluation based on the evaluation factors and their relative order of importance as indicated below.

Ultimately, the source selection decision will take into account the Contractor's capability to meet the requirements of this solicitation on a timely and cost-effective basis. The Government reserves such right of flexibility in making the source selection to assure placement of a contract in the Government's best interest in accordance with the evaluation criteria. Accordingly, the Government may award any resulting contract to other than the lowest-priced Offeror, or other than the Offeror with the highest technical merit rating.

#### **M.2.2. Degree of Relative Importance Assigned to Major Evaluation Factors and Sub-factors**

System performance, other technical, and past performance are roughly equivalent and each is significantly more important than price.

#### **M.3. SYSTEM PERFORMANCE**

The evaluation of system performance will be based upon measured benchmark performance as determined from the benchmark suite described in Section J and performance guarantees throughout the life of the contract. Two specific system performance metrics will be measured in order to distinguish between the capacity (the amount of total work performed during a given period of time) and capability (the performance of individual large applications) of the offered system. Aggregate system performance will be calculated by summing the monthly system performance during the base period of performance and the option period. System performance for the base period will be weighted more heavily than the option years.

#### **M.4. OTHER TECHNICAL**

The technical proposal will be evaluated with respect to, but not necessarily limited to, the following attributes. They are of roughly equal importance except that System Dependability and Numerical Reproducibility are the most important factors. System Dependability and Numerical Reproducibility are not only the most important factors under "Other Technical," they also serve as pass/fail criteria, as stated in Section M.1.1. The Government will conduct its evaluation by developing a list of strengths and weaknesses for the OCCS system attributes, other than System Performance, and assessing the impact upon NCEP requirements.

1. System dependability
2. Numerical Reproducibility
3. Run time variability
3. Extent and duration of any required code conversion, including Government and contractor support.
4. Integrated software engineering and development environment
5. System upgradability and serviceability
6. Disk subsystem performance, resiliency and reliability

11/10/2004

7. Hierarchical storage management system capacity, performance, resiliency and reliability
8. System memory, performance, resiliency and reliability.
9. Workload administration, scheduling, monitoring and execution
10. Network connectivity and performance
11. Production workload balancing with development workload
12. Support Personnel (including key personnel)
13. Training and Documentation
14. Data Migration Plan

#### **M.4.1 Primary/Backup System Design**

As discussed in Section C, NCEP requires the OCCS have the ability to support the production workload on either the Primary System or the Backup System, and to provide for a seamless failover in order to maintain NCEP's product delivery schedule. Offerors are encouraged to propose system designs that can enhance this capability and better ensure NCEP's ability to meet its on-time product generation requirements established by NOAA.

#### **M.5. PAST PERFORMANCE**

This factor will be rated based on the information and opinions gained by contacting the references listed in the proposal, firms with which the Offeror has a history of past performance, and possibly other customers known to the Government and others who may have useful and relevant information. The Government reserves the right not to contact all references provided and to contact other references even though not provided by the Offeror.

The following sub-factors will be considered (all sub-factors are of equal importance, with the exception of Cost Control, which is of lesser importance):

- ! Quality of products or service, compliance with contract requirements, accuracy of reports and technical excellence.
- ! Statistical analysis of dependability (availability, reliability, down time).
- ! Timeliness of performance.
- ! Cost control, remaining within budget, current accurate and complete billing, relationship of negotiated costs to actual costs and being cost efficient.
- ! Satisfaction of customer end users with the contractor's service.
- ! Business relations, management, an effective subcontracting program, reasonable and effective contractor-recommended solutions.

Assessment of the Offeror's past performance will be one means of evaluating the credibility of the Offeror's proposal, and relative capability to meet performance requirements.

Information will also be considered regarding any significant subcontractors.

Evaluation of past performance will include a determination of the Offeror's commitment to customer satisfaction and will include conclusions of informed judgment. The basis for the past performance rating will be documented.

During discussions Offerors will be given an opportunity to address unfavorable reports of past performance, if the Offeror has not had a previous opportunity to review the rating. Recent contracts will be examined to ensure that corrective measures have been implemented. Prompt corrective action in isolated instances may not outweigh overall negative trends.

Comment [bdg1]: We might want to talk to noncustomers that decided against becoming a customer. This language approximated that of FSL.

11/10/2004

If an Offeror does not have a past performance history relating to this solicitation, the Offeror will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on this factor.

**M.6. PRICE**

The price proposal will be evaluated for magnitude and realism, but will not be numerically scored. To be considered acceptable under this solicitation, the Offeror must propose fixed prices for the items being acquired.